

## REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claims 1-5 have been amended. The amendment to claim 2 is to place it in independent form and to improve its grammar, but does not narrow its scope. The amendments to claims 3-5 are to improve their grammar, but do not narrow their scope. Claim 8 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. New claims 9-12 have been added. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-7 and 9-12 are pending.

### *Allowable subject matter*

Applicants appreciate the indication that claims 2-7 contain allowable subject matter. Claim 2 has been amended to be in independent form, and thus is now in *prima facie* condition for allowance. Dependent claims 3-7 ultimately depend from claim 2, and are thus likewise in *prima facie* condition for allowance.

### *Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102*

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. 2005/0090279 to Witkowski (“Witkowski”). Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. 2004/0248514 to Idani (“Idani”). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 1, as amended, recites “the transmitting end device being an adaptor separable from the portable communication terminal and configured to connect to the portable communication terminal.” Neither Witkowski nor Idani disclose this feature of claim 1 in the context of that claim.

The Office Action refers to FIG. 10 and paragraphs [0079] and [0080] of Witkowski as disclosing the features of claim 1. Witkowski discloses an embodiment in FIG. 10 including a cell phone 98 with an RF transceiver 10a, where a wireless link is established between the RF transceiver 10a and an RF transceiver 10b in a vehicle 14.

In contrast to claim 1, however, Witkowski does not disclose its RF transceiver 10a to be an adaptor separable from a portable communication terminal (cell phone 98) and configured to connect to the portable communication terminal. Witkowski does not disclose or suggest that the RF transceiver 10a is separable from the cell phone 98 in the embodiment of FIG. 10. Moreover, in another embodiment of Witkowski incorporating a cell phone and RF transceiver 10a, Witkowski teaches that the RF transceiver 10a is integrated with the cellular phone 78 (See FIG. 8, paragraph [0067]). Thus, Witkowski teaches away from a system where the RF transceiver 10a is separable from its cell phone. Witkowski fails to anticipate claim 1 for at least this reason.

Idani likewise fails to disclose or suggest a “transmitting end device being an adaptor separable from the portable communication terminal and configured to connect to the portable communication terminal” as recited in claim 1. Idani discloses a portable terminal 1 including a wireless communication interface 11, which communicates with a wireless communication device 2 including a wireless communication interface 21 (See FIG. 1). In contrast to claim 1, however, Idani does not disclose that the wireless communication interface 11 is separable from the portable terminal 1. Idani fails to anticipate claim 1 for at least this reason.

Moreover, neither Witkowski nor Idani suggest the advantages of the system of claim 1 in providing flexibility for use with a portable communication terminal. Because the adapter is separable from the portable communication terminal, the portable communication terminal may be operated without the adaptor when the adaptor is not needed for performing functions of the portable communication terminal. When operation of the operated target is desired, a user may then simply connect the adaptor to the portable communications terminal to facilitate operation. Neither Witkowski nor Idani suggest this flexibility.

New independent claims 10-12 recite the “transmitting end device being an adaptor separable from the portable communication terminal and configured to connect to the portable communication terminal”, and thus are patentable for reasons analogous to claim 1.

New dependent claim 9 is patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1, from which it depends. Additionally, claim 9 recites "the adaptor is configured to be adaptable to a plurality of models of the portable communication terminal." Neither Witkowski nor Idani suggest this feature of claim 9.

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date December 28, 2005

By 

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP  
Customer Number: 22428  
Telephone: (202) 672-5485  
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

William T. Ellis  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 26,874

Thomas G. Bilodeau  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 43,438